



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

lev
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,400	03/31/2004	Benjamin N. Eldridge	P71C2-US	7966

50905	7590	10/31/2007
N. KENNETH BURRASTON		
KIRTON & MCCONKIE		
P.O. BOX 45120		
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84145-0120		

EXAMINER	
KARLSEN, ERNEST F	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2829	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/31/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ecowles@kmclaw.com
kburraston@kmclaw.com
patents@formfactor.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/815,400

Applicant(s)

ELDRIDGE ET AL.

Examiner

Ernest F. Karlsen

Art Unit

2829

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 47-49, 53-55, 60-63, 67, 70 and 71 are is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 47-49, 53-55, 60-63, 67, 70 and 71 are is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claims 47-49, 53-55, 60-63, 67, 70 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. It is not clear what is meant by "cutting edge" or "slice mark". The quoted terms do not appear in the original disclosure and are considered new matter.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 47-49, 53-55, 60-63, 67, 70 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kennedy. Kennedy shows, in Figure 6, a chip 13 with pads contacted by a probe in the form of a blade 71, see column 7, lines 63-67. The blade 71 inherently has a "cutting edge" along the part of the blade 71 that contacts the pad. Because the blade 71 is at the end of a cantilever arm 37a it will inherently deflect across the terminal. The blade 71 as shown in Figures 5-8 of Kennedy will inherently deflect in a motion that is approximately parallel to the length of the blade which is within plus or minus 45 degrees. The "cutting edge" of the blade inherently has to penetrate the surface to make contact.

Applicants argue that "cutting edge" and "slice mark" distinguish over "breaking" and "smashing". There is no such thing as an infinitely sharp edge and in the world of

the very small all edges will be blunt and smash through whatever surface they penetrate. There are meagasmashers and minismashers but there are no nonsmashers.

Claims 47-49, 53-55, 60-63, 67, 70 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is still not clear what the structural result would be for the semiconductor die that is tested by the process of any of the claims. No structural features are disclosed in the specification and no structural features are presented by the claims. What structural effects would result from the process steps of claims 60-63, 67, 70 and 71 is not clear. How such would lead to a functional change is not clear. The limitations added by claims 47-49 and 53-55 seem to be yet further away from having any influence on a functional change. What influence does the material composition of the blade have on the structure produced? No description of what the structure would look like for any of the claims is presented in the disclosure. Any structural result appears to be akin to placement of an identifying mark which appears to be a kind of printing. Thus what Applicants are claiming is an old device with some kind of printing thereon. Again no illustration of the structure is present in the specification or drawings so it is not clear what the product would be. It is not clear what is meant by "cutting edge" and "slice mark".

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Patents cited but not applied show additional probe apparatus where probes have "blade" structure.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ernest F. Karlsen whose telephone number is 571-272-1961. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hrs. Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ha Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-1678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/815,400
Art Unit: 2829

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ernest F. Karlsen
October 25, 2007


ERNEST KARLSEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER